

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/061,550	02/01/2002	Philippe Jacot	33923	2418
116 7	11/10/2004		EXAM	INER
PEARNE & GORDON LLP			BUDD, MARK OSBORNE	
1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	, OH 44114-3108		2834	

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Dr
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/061,550	JACOT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Budd	2834	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence addre	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		a reply be timely filed  airty (30) days will be considered timely.  DNTHS from the mailing date of this commandate of the commandate of t	munication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	May 2004.		
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the m	nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-39,41 and 42</u> is/are pending in the	e application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-22,41 and 42 is/	• • •	deration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 23-39</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documer			
2. Certified copies of the priority documer			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•	n received in this National St	age
application from the International Bures			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)	57		
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08</li> </ol>	3) 5) Notice of	Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [_] Other:	·	

Application/Control Number: 10/061,550

Art Unit: 2834

The final rejection mailed 7-15-04 is hereby withdrawn and replaced with the following office action.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 23-26 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taniguchi.

Taniguchi teaches a SAW having bus bars that are made of a different metal (e.g. AU v. A0) than that of the intergitated electrode fingers. Also, the bus bar can be thicker than the electrode layers and/or could be multi-layer structure that is thicker than the electrode fingers. Note fig. 11 and col. 18 line 26 to col. 19 line 63.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Brice or Nakano.

Lai teaches a Saw device using at least an aluminum electrode layer (#22) which is known to tend to migrate. At least a layer of titanium (#20) is placed between the aluminum and the piezo substrate material to help the aluminum stick to the piezo material. Lai does not teach providing an aluminum oxide layer on the top and side

Art Unit: 2834

surfaces of the aluminum layer. However, Brice (Figs 3, 4) and Nakano (Fig. 9) both teach providing a metal oxide layer over an aluminum electrode to prevent migration of the aluminum and provide protection from humidity. Thus, for at least these advantages it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in the art to add an aluminum oxide layer to the aluminum layer of Lai.

Claims 13-165 and 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Brice or Nakano as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Taniguchi.

These claims add that the bus bar is made of a different material and/or is a different thickness than the electrode fingers. Tuniguchi teaches providing such bus bar constructions (note discussion of Taniguchi above) to prevent unwanted wave propagation under the bus bars. Thus for at least this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide thicker/different metal bus bars in either Lai, Brice or Nakano.

Further cited of interest are Watanabe (366) and Yuhara.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark O. Budd whose telephone number is (571)272-2019. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor R. Ramirez, can be reached on \*\*\*. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/061,550

Art Unit: 2834

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Budd/ds

11/06/04

RIMARY EXAMINER